

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Monday, August 2, 1999
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

*Councilman Phil Gordon, Co-Chair, City of
Phoenix
Lloyd Harrell, Co-Chair, representing the
MAG Management Committee
Douglas Sanders, Goodyear, representing the
MAG Street Committee
Ray Jacobs, Glendale, representing the MAG
Billboard Task Force
Steve Hancock, Mesa, representing the MAG
Pedestrian Working Group

Mary O'Connor, Tempe, representing the MAG
Bicycle Task Force
*Shereen Lerner, representing Archaeological
and Historic Preservation
Angela Dye, representing the Arizona Society
of Landscape Architects
Judy Cook for Marcie Ellis representing the
West Valley Fine Arts Council

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Tom Ford, ADOT
Larz Garcia, ADOT
Michael Powell, Avondale
Patrice Kraus, Chandler
Mickey Ohland, Chandler
Bud Clutter, Fountain Hills
Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills
Pat Crawford, FQ Story Neighborhood
Elizabeth Hunter, FQ Story Neighborhood
Marc Madrigal, FQ Story Neighborhood
Thomas Barratt, Gila Bend
Carl Stephani, Gila Bend
Tami Ryall, Gilbert

Susan Bookspan, Glendale
Kate O'Mara, Mesa
Dawn M. Coomer, MAG
Aaron Iverson, MCDOT
Dora Vasquez, MCDOT
Tim Barnard, Peoria
Leigh Richards Fry, Phoenix
Bridget Schwartz-Manock, Phoenix
John Siefert, Phoenix
Roger Hallsted, Tempe
Betsy Moll, Tempe
Eric Iwersen, Tempe

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Lloyd Harrell at 1:05 p.m.

2. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Members of the Working Group and the audience introduced themselves.

3. Update on Enhancement Fund Process

MAG staff provided an update of the enhancement funds process. Transportation enhancements go beyond what is normally done in transportation, and enhancement projects can be in one of ten project areas, such as bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and historic preservation. Transportation Enhancements were authorized by ISTEA in 1991 and re-authorized by TEA-21 in 1998. Nationally, approximately \$36 million was available through ISTEA. ADOT has estimated that about \$11 million will be available for each year with the passage of TEA-21 — just to the state of Arizona. Approximately \$12 million statewide is available this funding cycle. Of this amount, \$7 million will be provided for projects on local roads and \$5 million for enhancement projects on state roads. Since 1994, over \$32 million of enhancement fund requests have been received by MAG (91 projects). This year, we have received 21 applications for state and local projects. \$6.3 million of enhancement fund projects were awarded to this region over the life of ISTEA. Nearly \$2.5 million, or 28 percent of the total awarded, in enhancement funds (5 projects) were given to this region last year. This is out of a total award amount of approximately \$8.9 million, or 25 projects.

4. Review and Discussion of Round VII Enhancement Fund Applications

The Working Group will reviewed and discussed the Round VII applications. During the review, Working Group members asked sponsors questions about their applications. Comments provided to applicants are listed below.

City of Avondale - McDowell Road Alternative Transportation Underpass West of Agua Fria River Bridge

- ▶ Cannot allow golf carts on this path width. Needs to be wider. Golf cart transportation is not eligible use for transportation enhancement funds.
- ▶ 16 ft' wide path is needed for golf cart transportation. 12 ft' path is needed for non-motorized transportation. Usually a separate equestrian path is provided to avoid conflicts with bikes and pedestrians.
- ▶ May need to restrict access to non-motorized uses only if the width cannot be expanded.
- ▶ Connection to shopping center needs to be shown on the map.
- ▶ The federal share for this project can be increased to \$500,000.

City of Chandler - Chandler Paseo Project Phase Three

- ▶ Map in the back of the document is confusing. The map should be changed to show the different phases.
- ▶ Equestrian portion of the pathway is not eligible for funding with transportation enhancement funds. Use local funds for this portion of the trail, and note that local funds

- ▶ pay for equestrian portion in the application.
- ▶ Clarify the location of lighting in the application.

City of Chandler - Chandler Paseo Project Phase Six

- ▶ State projects are generally on state right-of-way. This may not qualify for state eligibility.
- ▶ Map in the back of the document is confusing. The map should be changed to show the different phases.
- ▶ Equestrian portion of the pathway is not eligible for funding with transportation enhancement funds. Use local funds for this portion of the trail, and note that local funds pay for equestrian portion in the application.
- ▶ Clarify the location of lighting in the application.

Town of Fountain Hills - Falcon Point Scenic Overlook

- ▶ May need a wider path to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. Six feet is generally good for pedestrians only. Recommend a 10 foot width.
- ▶ Not eligible under scenic highway program.
- ▶ Strengthen multimodal aspects of enhancements to the overlook. This seems like a project for autos. Show how the path and bike lanes connect.
- ▶ Show how pedestrian access is improved.
- ▶ Explain how lighting is provided in the facility.
- ▶ Explain the scenic vista which is enhanced (show that it's not just houses). What area is preserved open space?
- ▶ Add support letters to the application.

Town of Gila Bend - Transportation Museum and Static Display Area

- ▶ This is a local project, not a state project.
- ▶ A map is needed, and some photos would be helpful.
- ▶ Remove historic preservation category from application.

Town of Gilbert - Heritage Trail - Chandler Segment

- ▶ Need to make path width more prominent in application.
- ▶ Explain that equestrian is along one bank; paved multi-use path on the other.
- ▶ Add a cross-section of the path.
- ▶ Cost for multi-use path may be too low.
- ▶ Change title of application to "Heritage Trail Multiuse Path."
- ▶ Cannot fund equestrian paths with enhancements funding; emphasize that this portion is paid for with local funds in application.
- ▶ Differentiating between Mesa and Chandler segments on map would be helpful.
- ▶ Need to determine preference for funding these segments.

Town of Gilbert - Heritage Trail - Mesa Segment

See above.

City of Glendale - Glendale's Centennial Gateway Plaza

- ▶ May be required to fund public art with local funds. Emphasize this in the application.
- ▶ Remove the wall. A seating wall is alright, but access to the pocket park should not be limited. The park provides a visual enhancement to this area.
- ▶ Note in application that underpass being constructed in area will provide access to this plaza.
- ▶ Note that users will come from a variety of places — bicyclists, pedestrians, transit stop.

City of Glendale - Historic Catlin Court Alleyway Shared Use and Enhancement Project

- ▶ A very good project.
- ▶ Need to make more references to how garbage trucks will move through, and that it will be wide enough to accommodate these vehicles.
- ▶ Need to educate TERC on what this concept is based upon.
- ▶ Need to describe pedestrian and auto mix, and how pedestrian safety is assured.

City of Glendale - Thunderbird Paseo Shared Use Path-marshall Ranch Bridge to Sweetwater

- ▶ Correct typo on page two to show accurate match rate.
- ▶ Explain that curves in path are necessary to accommodate changing topography and ADA requirements.

Maricopa County Department of Transportation - McDowell Mountain Road Bicycle Lanes Project

- ▶ Need to explain that high cost is due to preparation of dirt shoulders.
- ▶ Emphasize that ramada is included. Show how ramada will be accessed from the bike lanes. Show some landscaping near the ramada. The picture in the application seems rather bleak.

City of Peoria - Grand Avenue (U.S. 60) Pedestrian Crossing

- ▶ Note that this is an at-grade crossing.
- ▶ Black-and-white map is confusing. Need a better map. Explain where crossing is. Call them at-grade existing crossings; note that crosswalks already exist.

City of Peoria - West Valley Multi-modal Corridor Demonstration Project

- ▶ Call this a multi-use path, not trail.
- ▶ Show where this segment is on the location map, and show connection to Sun Circle Trail.
- ▶ Maybe add some graphics from the West Valley Recreation Study to this document.
- ▶ Clarify why lighting is not on the path.
- ▶ Does not qualify for historic preservation.
- ▶ Metropolitan Canal Alliance has a good trails map; need better map of Sun Circle Trail.

City of Phoenix/FQ Story Historic District - F.Q. Story Historic District, on I-10

- ▶ Need to clarify location of project in the application.
- ▶ Cobblestone doesn't slow down traffic. May want to look at other traffic calming measures to strengthen application.
- ▶ Cobblestone not good for elderly or ADA.
- ▶ City needs to work with group to develop stronger application, and meet ADA requirements.
- ▶ Need to discuss positive impacts for pedestrians in application rather than focusing on negative traffic impacts. Explain benefits more.
- ▶ Community participation does not qualify. Phoenix should help to address this.
- ▶ Good community support. A noble effort.

City of Phoenix - 2nd Avenue Pedestrian and Landscaping Enhancement

- ▶ What will sidewalk width be?
- ▶ Are any existing sidewalks historic? Need to verify this.
- ▶ Could the 14 ft. lanes be narrowed?
- ▶ Add some interesting information on the Roosevelt Historic District.
- ▶ Angled parking is very bad next to bike lanes. Need to have parallel parking. Could have different paving between bike lane and parked cars.

City of Phoenix - 7th Avenue Street Environment Enhancement

- ▶ Where is the bike element? Could one be included?
- ▶ Match seems low.
- ▶ Need to clarify/improve map.
- ▶ Cannot do transit stop enhancements with this funding. Remove from application, or fund with local dollars.

City of Phoenix - Jackson Street Pedestrian Improvements

- ▶ Need to lower federal share to \$500,000.
- ▶ Width of sidewalk should be mentioned earlier in application.
- ▶ Note that this project is in a warehouse district to strengthen application.

City of Tempe - Phase I of Creamery Railroad Multi-use Path, Artist Designed Elements and Landscaping

- ▶ None.

City of Tempe - Rio Salado/scottsdale Pathway Link, Rural Road to Indian Bend Wash

- ▶ Obtain a letter of support from Scottsdale.
- ▶ Need to check why this project was not funded last year by TERC.
- ▶ Might want to put in local funding category; Tempe will verify.

City of Tempe - Tempe Canal Multi-use Path

- ▶ Is the developer provision time sensitive?

Town of Wickenburg - Us 60 Milepost 106.0 to Milepost 108.9

- ▶ Even with response addressing Bike Committee comments, still not a strong application. Pathway next to highway may not be viewed favorably at the state level.
- ▶ Should be 10 feet wide to be a multi-use path, or put on both sides of the highway.
- ▶ Could call this a sidewalk, and leave at 5 feet wide. Sidewalks are funded with enhancement funds along state roadways.
- ▶ Graphics need to show connections to activity centers.
- ▶ Need to add more to the application (all questions need responses).

5. Other Items Relevant to the Round VII and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

No items were discussed.

6. Future Meeting Dates

The next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held on Monday, August 16, 1999 at 1:00 p.m. at the MAG office. The purpose of this meeting will be to rank enhancement fund applications.

If necessary, an additional meeting may be scheduled after the August 16th meeting.